the constitutions and bylaws of the union. There is in section 403 reference to the frequency of elections as required by a union constitution and bylaws but the enforcement provisions of section 402 do not appear to apply to section 403.

In respect of terms of office, section 401(a) provides that every national or international labor organization, except a federation of such organizations, "shall elect its officers not less often than once every five years" either by secret ballot among the members, or at a convention of delegates chosen by secret ballot. Subsections (b) and (d) provide that for local labor organizations ,the period is 3 years, and that for officers of "intermediate bodies" like general committees, system boards or joint councils, the period is 4 years. There may be a question whether these periods run from the effective date of the act, or from the last election. Within the limited time allowed for this analysis, no definite evidence of Congressional expression on this issue has been found. If the Congressional intent was found to be that the period runs from the last election even though it was prior to the effective date of the act, for example, in the case of the 5-year rule for national labor organizations, that if the last election was in 1958, then another election is to be held not later than 1963, such an interpretation would not seem to be prohibited by any Constitutional limitation. A statutory provision to that effect would appear to be no more, and perhaps less assailable for retroactivity or unreasonable classification than the "habitual criminal" acts which the Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld, *McDonald* v. *Massachusetts* (180 U.S. 311 (1901)), *Graham* v. *West Virginia* (224 U.S. 616 (1912)), *Carlesi* v. *New York* (233 U.S. 51 (1914)), and *Gryger* v. *Burke* (334 U.S. 728, 732 (1948)). Recently the Supreme Court upheld a New York law excluding convicted felons from offices in waterfront unions, *De Veau* v. *Braisted*, — U.S. — (June 6, 1960).

Three paragraphs of section 401 include references to the constitutions and bylaws of the labor organization and each of these deals with election procedures. Subsection (e) requires that there be a reasonable opportunity for the nomination of candidiates, that any member in good standing is eligible to be a candidate, that he has the right to vote without improper interference or reprisal, that at least 15 days notice of selection be given, that employer withholding of dues is payment for purposes of eligibility, and that election records be preserved for 1 year. The final sentence in the subsection is that: "The election shall be conducted in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of such organization insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title." This sentence, being a part of subsection (e) would not seem to apply to other subsections, such as those relating to terms of office. Subsection (f) provides that when officers are chosen by a convention of elected delegates, the convention is to be conducted in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the organization insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provision of the statute. This would seem to apply not to when a convention is to be held, but to the manner in which it is to be conducted. Subsection (h) authorizes a conditional procedure for removal of an elected officer guilty of serious misconduct. The procedure involves application by a union member, a hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, a finding by the Secretary that the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization do not provide an adequate procedure for removal of such an officer, and a secret ballot vote by members in good standing. The vote is to be conducted by the officers of the union in accordance with the constitution and bylaws, insofar as not inconsistent with the statute.

The provisions of section 402, relating to enforcement, describe the scope of the complaint which a union member may file with the Secretary of Labor, and the scope of the court proceedings which he may, upon proper findings, institute in the courts. The complaint is to allege "the violation of any provision of section 401 (including violation of the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization pertaining to the election and removal of officers)." The parenthetical clause by itself might be construed to include union rules on the terms of office or frequency of elections, but as a parenthetical clause relating to provisions of section 401 it would seem to be limited to the scope of such provisions and as previously noted they prescribe the maximum interval between elections without reference to the frequency requirements of union constitutions. The purposes for which the Secretary of Labor may bring a court action (after making certain findings) are, as specified in section 402(b) "to set aside the invalid election, if any, and to direct the conduct of an election or hearing and vote upon the removal of officers under the supervision of the Secretary." In respect of the power of the court, section 402(c) provides that if the court finds:

"(1) that an election has not been held within the time prescribed by section 401, or

"(2) that the violation of section 401 may have affected the outcome of an election," the court is to "declare the election, if any, to be void and direct the conduct of a new election under the supervision of the Secretary and, so far as lawful and practicable, in conformity with the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization." The statute also provides for entry of a decree on the persons elected, and for a decree in proceedings on the removal of an officer under section 401(h) described previously.

The first of the alternative findings required for court action relates to the terms of office, and the second, presumably to the election procedures. Both are limited to violations of section 401 and, as previously noted that section, in prescribing the maximum interval between elections does not refer to the constitution or bylaws of a labor organization. In this matter there seems to be a difference between the treatment of terms of office and the manner of conducting an election or convention and this distinction is also implicit in the House and Senate reports on the original bills, House Report No. 741 on H.R. 8342, 86th Congress, 1st session, pp. 3, 15–17; Senate Report No. 187 on S. 1555, 86th Congress, 1st session, pp. 3, 4, 19–22.

There is, of course, the possibility that the provisions of union constitutions or bylaws on the frequency of elections may be enforceable under some other statutory provision, or upon some commonly recognized legal principles. Moreover, the interpretation of the provisions on elections in the 1959 act involve a number of arguable points, but an opinion that the authority to deal with the timing of elections is limited to the maximum interval requirements prescribed in section 401 would not seem to be unreasonable, on the basis of this limited analysis.

(Mr. COLLIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of this discussion certainly raises a pertinent issue, sufficiently so that I thought it worth while to stay until this late hour to listen. The question of when and under what conditions the Federal courts should administer or govern the internal affairs of any institution or organization has frequently been one of great controversy, so much so that it seems that Congress should spell out to the letter of the law the jurisdictional areas of the courts. Until it does, this will continue to be a problem involving one conflict after another. As a matter of fact, in some instances such controversies have developed over the matter of seizure of assets of business establishments by agencies of government even when such powers are invested by law.

Only yesterday there was a heated debate on the floor of this House with regard to the seizure of the assets of the Long Beach Savings & Loan Association by the Board of the Federal Home Loan Bank.

Yet, to what extent the powers of the courts shall go in governing the internal affairs of union organizations is of concern to many people. That is why I believe it is necessary that Congress provide such laws so that the question involves the principle rather than the principals.

It was my understanding that when Congress passed the Landrum-Griffin bill, which I supported without equivocation a year ago, it did so seeking to provide ground rules to preserve the assets of labor unions through the disclosure and election provisions of this act.

Legislation dealing with any and all organizations sanctioned by the law of the land, whether it be business or labor, must be a two-way street with rules of equity applying in every instance.

Now let there be no mistake that I believe in preserving the traditional power of the courts to make amends or remedy violations of the law; but I question the wisdom of establishing a policy to permit the courts to delegate powers to a third party or parties in a manner that would tend to take over control of the assets or operating functions of any organization.

In this connection my attention was recently drawn to an editorial commenting on this subject which appeared in the Wall Street Journal and which pointed directly to the prevailing situation involving the question of the Teamsters Union. The editorial questioned the precedent involved and the wisdom of a Federal judge trying to run the labor union.

As things now stand, I believe there exists a legislative vacuum with regard to the intent or will of Congress insofar as jurisdiction or authority of the court in running a labor union. In view of this, it would certainly seem that Congress should spell out its will and intent so that any question in this regard be eliminated. That is, if the Landrum-Griffin bill, passed in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, has not already done so in the sections covering elections and reports on union funds.

A REPORT ON A HARMONIOUS EAST-WEST FOOTHILLS PEACE CONFERENCE IN STOCKHOLM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gen-

using his powers to end the stalemated situation. My letter was as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

Hon. JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: If you will please look over my letter to you of April 19 regarding efforts of Teamsters Union rank-and-file members in St. Louis and elsewhere to arrange for an international convention for the election of officers, I am sure you will agree the acknowledgement I received from Mr. Gilhooley dated April 29 did not provide the information I requested.

Mr. Gilhooley said the matter is in the courts and that therefore it would not be proper for you to interfere. I would still like to know, however, what powers you believe the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 gives you to arrange for a convention of this union. While it may be inappropriate, as you contend, for you to intervene at this point, I did want to get a clear picture of your powers in this matter as you see them.

Furthermore, I would appreciate knowing at what stage or level or point—assuming the litigation should drag out for years—you would consider intervening.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

SURPRISING POINT RAISED BY SECRETARY MITCHELL AS TO HIS AUTHORITY TO ASSURE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS BY ANY UNION BEFORE 1964

On May 20, the Secretary of Labor replied to my renewed request for facts as to his powers in this matter. I think many Members will find one of the points in his letter as surprising as I did. As I read the Secretary's letter, no union can be required to hold a national convention and election before 1964, unless its own constitution and bylaws should require it. This is based on an assumption that the requirement of the 1959 act making it mandatory for unions to hold conventions or elections at least once every 5 years does not take effect until 5 years after enactment of the 1959 law.

I think most of us were under the impression, when this provision was written into law, that it would force any union which has not held a convention in the past 5 years to hold one almost immediately. I think most of us believe the 5-year period began following the date of the last convention.

Rather than attempt to interpret the Secretary's statement on this point, however, Mr. Speaker, I will let his letter speak for itself. The text of that letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, May 20, 1960.

The Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This will acknowledge your letter of May 5 in which you inquired what powers the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 confers on the Secretary of Labor to arrange for a convention of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters for the purpose of the election of officers.

As you undoubtedly know, section 401(a) of the act requires national and international labor organizations (except a federation of such organizations) to elect their officers at least every 5 years by secret ballot among the members in good standing or at a convention of delegates chosen by secret ballot. Section 402 of the act sets forth the enforcement procedures for the election provisions under which union members, after having exhausted or unsuccessfully invoked their internal union remedies, may file a complaint with the Secretary and under which the Secretary shall bring a civil action to compel compliance with the election provisions if, after investigating such complaint, he finds probable cause to believe that a violation of the election provisions has occurred and has not been remedied.

This brief résumé of the pertinent provisions of the act shows that the Secretary has not been given any power or authority under the act to arrange for union conventions through any direct action. Also no complaint has been filed in this matter pursuant to the provisions of section 402 which might set in motion the procedures with a view to the possible institution of civil court action. In any case, the 5-year period referred to in section 401(a) is, in our opinion, to be measured from the date of the last election or from the date title IV of the act becomes applicable to the particular union, whichever is later. Thus, the earliest date on which a national or international union is required by the act (as distinct from its own constitution and bylaws) to hold an election of officers, either by membership ballot or by convention, is in 1964.

You also inquire at what stage of the presently pending court action I would consider intervening, if this litigation should continue for years. Without knowing what facts and circumstances may arise in the course of the future progress of this litigation, it is obviously impossible for me to give you a definite answer to that question.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

DOES SECRETARY'S INTERPRETATION REFLECT INTENT OF CONGRESS?

Mr. Speaker, I have asked a number of Members of the House whose knowledge of labor-management law I respect, and who were active in the debates and discussions leading up to the enactment of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, if the Secretary's interpretation of his powers in this particular respect is in line with the intent of Congress in writing this provision into the law. Every Member with whom I have discussed this has told me he believes that the Secretary's position is contrary to what Congress intended.

If that is the case, then I believe it is incumbent upon those who played leading roles in the drafting and enactment of the 1959 law to get busy now and clear up this difference of opinion. If a union has failed to call a national convention for 5 years in the absence of any requirement in its constitution or bylaws forcing it to do so, it would now appear that no action could be taken on this in behalf of the rank and file before 1964. That would appear to make this feature of the 1959 law nothing more than window dressing—completely meaningless. Why, one might ask, was it so urgent to pass in 1959 a comprehensive law to insure democracy in unions if one of the key provisions was to have no force and effect for 5 years thereafter? I am sure that is not what Congress intended.

HASTY ANALYSIS BY LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Several days ago—again to be certain that I was not reading more significance into this matter than it deserved—I asked the Legislative Reference Service's American Law Section to make a quick search of the legislative background on this point to see if the Secretary's interpretation matched congressional intent. The American Law Section has, from time to time, provided me and other Members with outstanding help on technical issues of law and I suppose I tend to expect miracles from them. What follows is a report which was compiled in just a day or so—on extremely short notice—and I think it is only fair for me to point out that I did not give them sufficient time to do a complete check. Nevertheless, I am sure students of labor-management law will find this analysis extremely helpful in the resolution of this particular unanswered point of law.

I am therefore submitting the analysis for printing at this point so that Members who are interested in following up this matter, and the committees and their staffs will have before them all of the data which I have on it. I hope this matter will be pursued by the appropriate committees and that if there is any question as to when the Secretary could act in such situations, the facts can be clearly established.

Certainly, we all realize that provisions of the 1959 act will be subject to litigation and differing interpretations and innumerable disputes in the forthcoming months and years. I think it would be helpful therefore if any unnecessary confusion can be cleared up quickly rather than let all of these issues drag out in endless court battles. Laws should be enacted to smooth the paths of intergroup relationships, not confound and confuse them. So I hope we can clear up this point quickly.

The analysis provided me by the Library of Congress on the point raised by the Secretary is as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1960.

To: Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Authority of the Secretary of Labor to institute proceedings for a union election under the Labor Act of 1959.

The portion of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 relating to the election of union officers (73 Stat. 519, 532–534) presents a number of interpretative problems and in the limited time allowed for this analysis, no definite answers have been found in the legislative history of the act. However, it appears that statutory provisions on the authority of the Secretary of Labor to institute proceedings for an election, might conceivably be interpreted as affording union members only limited remedies insofar as frequency of elections is concerned.

The portion of the act on elections, that is, title IV, has three subtitles, Terms of Office, Election Procedures, and Enforcement, and while the first two are both dealt with in section 401 some of the subsections on procedures expressly refer to the constitutions and bylaws of the labor organization, whereas the subsections on the terms of office, which in effect control the frequency of elections, contain no express reference to

tleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I returned the day before yesterday from Stockholm where I attended a meeting of the Preparatory Committee of the East-West Round Table.

This is my report on who was there and what was done.

Other conferees included members of Parliaments from Belgium, France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and Sweden. From Norway came the Secretary of Finn Moe, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Norwegian Parliament. Paolo Vittorelli, secretary of the Italian Socialist Party, was there from Italy.

Our assignment was to prepare for the Fourth East-West Round Table Conference, a meeting of parliamentarians and experts to be held in Paris this fall. But, as you will see from the statement which I shall read in full, we also agreed on a declaration of principles which the summit breakdown made, in our opinion, all the more urgent.

As I left the National Airport in Washington last Friday for Stockholm, the headline on the front page of the Washington Daily News said: "K. Excoriates Ike; No New East-West Talk Expected for Long Time."

Ilya Ehrenburg, leading Soviet writer and member of the Supreme Soviet, did confer harmoniously with us from the West in Stockholm. All of us from the West except our host, Senator Georg Branting, of Sweden, came from NATO countries. This unpretentious but unique meeting of parliamentarians was far from a summit meeting, although it may be as close as the United States and the Soviet Union get for at least a few months.

It is true that our East-West talks were unofficial. Nobody ever implied otherwise, although my colleague from New York [Mr. MILLER], in his capacity as chairman of the Republican national congressional committee, issued, on the day I left, a press release about my making this trip.

A LETTER TO THE SPEAKER

He informed the press that he had written to the Speaker of the House asking him to make clear that my attendance was neither sponsored nor sanctioned by Congress. It is a mystery to me how the gentleman could believe that any such action by the Speaker was necessary or appropriate.

The gentleman does concede that my attendance as a private citizen was not illegal. I would like to think that, after he is better informed, he would count my attendance worthwhile as a Member of Congress from a nation seeking peace in a precarious world.

If the gentleman feels that my trip to Stockholm was a waste of my time as a Congressman, at least he must concede that the trip cost the taxpayers nothing. My expenses were paid by Cyrus Eaton, a Cleveland industrialist, and a man who seeks peace with all the resourceful aggressiveness and dogged persistence which he used to amass 100-million-or-more dollars.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], in his press release, declared obscurely he did not recognize Cyrus Eaton as a congressional sponsor. I know of no such claim by myself, by Mr. Eaton, or by anyone else. When I went to a full session of this East-West round-table group in London last February at Westminster Palace, Mr. Eaton also paid my expenses and those of several other American delegates. For a report on this meeting see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 10, 1960, beginning on page 2179. No one at that time concerned himself in the slightest about the propriety of my being there or about Mr. Eaton's payment of my expenses. Under unanimous consent I am including following these remarks the text of the consensus adopted by the 60 participants from 16 East-West nations at that meeting.

A TELEGRAM FROM CYRUS EATON

Cyrus Eaton sent us conferees in Stockholm a telegram. It said, in part:

> Never in the history of the world has there been a time when men of good will should work so earnestly and persistently to make reason prevail in the face of the public uproar made by the fanatics and lunatics who would precipitate an all-out nuclear holocaust.

I agree with Mr. Eaton. I believe that most of my constituents and other Americans and peoples of other nations agree. These are dangerous times. We do need to work earnestly and persistently if reason is to prevail.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it will be most regretable if this embarrassment of the summit breakdown causes Republican leaders to continue to attempt to ridicule and to belittle conferences such as the one I just attended in Stockholm. No one should discourage any Member of Congress or other Government employee from trying to educate himself so that he can do his job better.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] referred in his press release to the meeting as "this molehill summit conference." Foothill, molehill, anthill, who cares if the meeting did tend to advance the cause of world peace even a little bit? I think we all should do whatever we can, however little it may be.

I feel sure that President Eisenhower does not agree with the gentleman from New York. Peaceful coexistence requires contact and negotiations at all levels and in spite of the many irritations. The only alternative to peaceful coexistence is war, incredibly disastrous war that nobody wants and that nobody can win. I am sure the President realizes this fact.

Last weekend I conferred for 16 hours in Stockholm to help put a statement in its final form. We discussed the summit and the events before and after it, not to fix blame, but to see what could be done to revive a measure of confidence and trust between the East and the West.

PRESIDENT SHOULD BE REINVITED

My chief proposal does not appear in this statement because all my fellow conferees agreed that it was, to use Mr. Ehrenburg's word, "utopian." I asked for a strong declaration in the statement recommending that both sides take steps to reinstate the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union. Nothing could do more, in my opinion, to reassure a shaken world.

The reissuance and the reacceptance of the invitation may require some sacrifice of dignity by both Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. Such sacrifices would be almost unprecedented, dramatic, and most encouraging.

It is fair that President Eisenhower should visit the Soviet Union and be given the same opportunities that Premier Khrushchev had here to talk to the people. The Soviet people would like him, in spite of U–2, and they would believe him when he told them, as he would repeatedly, that the United States of America wants peace and has no militaristic or imperialistic ambitions.

If the leaders in the Soviet Government want peace, and I believe they do, they should reissue the invitation to the President. If the President wants peace, and I know he does, he will accept the invitation.

Mr. Ehrenburg said he and many Soviet citizens regretted that their Premier had made the recent violent personal attacks on the President. He explained them by saying that Khrushchev is an emotional man "who does not need to look in his pockets for words," which means he gets carried away when speaking without a manuscript. Khrushchev, Ehrenburg said, was deeply disappointed in the President and embarrassed because he had told high Soviet officials that Ike was a fine fellow and a man of peace.

Ehrenburg offered an explanation about the reference that Khrushchev made with respect to the President becoming superintendent of a kindergarten. He said that this was because Khrushchev was truly impressed and touched by the concern that the President showed for the Eisenhower grandchildren.

POWERS MAY NOT BE PUNISHED

[redacted]t, Francis Powers, Ehrenburg predicted that he would be tried, found guilty and then perhaps given a nominal sentence or sent back to the United States at once. He said he felt there was no personal animosity against Powers himself, although Ehrenburg stressed that Soviet public indignation against the U–2 flights was general and intense.

Erik Nord of Norway, a Government foreign affairs expert, told us that the Norwegians felt resentment toward the United States for involving their country in the U–2 flights without prior arrangement.

Mr. Ehrenburg said Marshal Malinovsky, the Soviet military chief who accompanied Mr. Khrushchev to Paris and elsewhere, was a soldier, not a politician, and had been appointed by Premier Khrushchev. "He will do what he is told to do," Ehrenburg said.

The recent Malinovsky order to launch rocket with atomic warheads against airbases from which trespassing planes fly is not significant, Ehrenburg told us. It

did not mean any reckless fingers on the triggers or buttons, he indicated.

Before I read the statement which was agreed on at this meeting in Stockholm last weekend, let me give you a few facts about each of the other seven participants:

STOCKHOLM CONFEREES

Paul Anxionnaz, 58 France: O Member of the Chamber of Deputies, former Secretary of State for Armed Forces, 1956; Chairman of National Defense Committee, Chamber of Deputies, 1946–51. Radical-Socialist Party, middle-left.

Senator Georg Branting, 73, Sweden: A lawyer born in 1887 in Stockholm. Member of Stockholm City Council, 1927–38; member of the Labor Party board in Stockholm; member of the Swedish Refugee Commission; member of the Social Democratic Party; Senator since 1931.

Ilya Ehrenburg, 69, Soviet Union: Member of the Supreme Soviet, leading writer.

Erik Nord, 41, Norway: Assistant to Senator Finn Moe, chairman of Foreign Affairs Commission of the Norwegian Storting—Parliament.

Henri Rolin, 69, Belgium: Secretary of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1919; Belgium's representative to Locarno Conference, 1925; Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law, 1930; San Francisco Conference, 1945; member of Belgium's delegation to the U.N., 1948; member of delegation to the General Assembly of the Council of Europe since 1948; president of the Commission of Juridical Affairs of the Council of Europe; president of Belgium Commission of Justice; senator since 1932; president of the senate, 1957–49. Senator Rolin is the only living person who helped draft both the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Charter of the United Nations.

Paola Vittorelli, Italy: Journalist, secretary of the Italian Socialist Party.

Konni Zilliacus, Great Britain, Member of Parliament; member of foreign affairs and defense groups of Parliamentary Labour Party; once with the League of Nations. Speaks six languages fluently, including Russian. His wife is an American from California. She has relatives in my district.

Our conferences were held in the home of Senator Branting in a large living room lined with bookshelves. We spoke in French and English. My limited French made it necessary to have everything translated into English. Ehrenburg speaks no English but excellent French. We issued our report in both languages.

The report is as follows:

We, the undersigned members of the Preparatory Committee of the Fourth East-West Round-Table Conference, met in Stockholm on June 5 and 6, 1960, and agreed unanimously to issue this statement:

1. The collapse of the summit conference and the reactions to which it led must not be allowed to endanger peaceful coexistence and to let the world fall back into the cold war.

2. Recent events have confirmed the soundness of the view expressed by our last Round-Table Conference, February 1960, that "the division of the world into rival military alliances puts peace at the mercy of an incident and subjects mankind to constant peril."

3. It became urgent that some first agreements be reached in the negotiations now taking place in Geneva on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests and disarmament. Special attention ought to be given to the Soviet disarmament proposals of June 2, 1960.

4. At the basis of every move toward the consolidation of peace must be the strict observance by all states of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law, e.g., the one forbidding unauthorized flights over the territory of other states.

5. States other than the Big Four must become aware of their own responsibility in the strengthening of peace and initiate constructive proposals. Public opinion ought to promote and support such action.

6. War is not an inevitable fatality. The threat of it can always be removed by the will of mutual comprehension and negotiation aiming at equitable solutions acceptable by all.

We announce that the Fourth East-West Round Table Conference will be held in the autumn of this year. Its task will be to confront with the above stated principles the international situation existing at that time, particularly with respect to disarmament.

It will specifically endeavor to find means:

A. How to solve the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations, so as to achieve the participation of Communist China in any disarmament agreement.

B. How to accomplish some degree of demilitarization of the center of Europe so as to put an end to growing fears created by German rearmament.

C. How to obtain efficient application of the Charter of the United Nations where negotiations among the Big Four fail to reach agreement.

I know that many of my colleagues in Congress agree with the principles stated in Stockholm and agree as to the importance of the problems listed.

Ehrenburg thought the most important aspects of the statement were with respect to the recital of the need to include China in disarmament negotiations and the statement about giving special attention to the recent Soviet disarmament proposals. He thought that it was heartening that a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and a member of the Supreme Soviet could agree on such vital matters.

This may show the need for such communication even with regard to a well-informed, sophisticated man like Ilya Ehrenburg. After all, Secretary of State Herter said months ago that China would have to be a part of any disarmament plan, although since then the administration has made no move to make this probable or even possible.

Stevenson, Kennedy, and Symington have all indicated that we have to change our policies with regard to China and open up channels of communication.

As for the Soviet disarmament plan, whatever its shortcomings, at least it is a plan. We do not have one that is as specific. It is certainly a basis for negotiation. It does contain concessions to previously expressed western points of view. The entire Soviet plan is set forth following these remarks. It is worth reading in full.

There are indeed growing fears about German rearmament. The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] spoke on this subject March 23 in the other body. We need a "new situation for Berlin," he said. The move toward reunification was a rational urge which may well be supplanted by an irrational urge if adjustments are not made, he predicted. He said that "a substantial body of Germans already identify East Germany as middle Germany and look to lands beyond the Oder-Neisse as the true East."

The distinguished and very able majority whip of the other body [Mr. MANSFIELD] believes that all of Berlin should be under United Nations control and that its independence should be guaranteed, not only by the United Nations, but specifically by both the Soviet Union and the West. Ehrenburg indicated that he believed Soviet troops in Berlin under U.N. control would help guard its independence.

In our short conference we had neither the time nor the resources to go into these questions in any detail. I am certainly not attempting to offer any solutions today. We shall go into these questions carefully when we have a larger meeting of parliamentarians in the autumn. It is hoped that a number of my colleagues, both from the House and from the other body, will find it possible to attend and to participate.

More people every day are recognizing the danger of the arms race and the need for more negotiations. The columnist, Constantine Brown, wrote in the Star recently:

It is becoming clearer every day, in the light of the facts, that mankind is either going to get better organized or is going to be destroyed sooner or later.

On June 5 Prime Minister Nehru of India declared that he believes that the great powers will be forced to come together again in some fashion. He says that this is inevitable because of the "logic and the compulsion of events." Like it or not, we have to climb back to the summit.

"Otherwise," Nehru said, "you sit on the brink of a horrible catastrophe and you can fall over into it at any time." It is clear that the only alternative to war is "talks and peaceful approaches," as Mr. Nehru states.

Winston Churchill has said that jaw, jaw, jaw is better than war, war, war. We have to keep the lines of communication open. One way is to encourage conferences of parliamentarians like the one I just attended in Stockholm. Our meetings are unofficial, our decisions are not binding, but we do learn from each other and we do find a large and vital area of agreement on issues which must be settled among the world's nations in the very near future if mankind is to survive.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 10, 1960]

CONSENSUS OF THIRD EAST-WEST ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCE, PALACE OF WESTMINSTER, FEBRUARY 2–4, 1960

Participants in this conference of 16 nations, including for the first time members of the legislatures of both the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., met for unofficial East-West talks and as a result of 3-day discussion of various problems connected to